DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 179 UD 019 274

AUTHOR Gordon, Edmund
TITLE The Political Economics of Effective Schooling.
PUB DATE [79]
NOTE 25p.; Not available in hard copy due to the reproduction quality of the original document

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; *Failure Factors; *Intellectual Development; Low Income Groups; Minority Groups; *Nature Nurture Controversy; School Responsibility

ABSTRACT

Two lines of argument have been advanced to support the assertion that schooling makes little difference in the efforts of low status people to achieve equality or a fair chance at survival. One says that the genetic inferiority of certain races makes them incapable of benefitting from schooling. Although there is no hard biological evidence to support this viewpoint, it has been widely publicized and used as an argument against compensatory education. The second argument asserts that schools are not effective forces in changing the life chances of pupils. The view that schooling and the achievement of economic equality have little direct relationship has been used to justify reduced expenditures on schooling and lower demands on education. However, the problems of educating disadvantaged populations who have been systematically deprived of educational opportunity require attention to issues such as differential patterns of intellectual and social function; health-related conditions affecting children and their ability to learn; ethnic and cultural incongruities between school staff and the children and community; and schools' accountability as social institutions. As things now stand, arguments against effective schooling rely on questionable research which serves to relieve schools and the society of the responsibility for providing equal education. (Author/WI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED169179

THE POLITICAL ECONOMICS OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING

Edmund Gordon
Tecchers College, Columbia University

Almost as serious as is the failure of our society to insure the optimal development of all its members, is the repeated effort at excusing the society and its institutions from responsibility for insuring such development. Over the years the arguments vary. At one time we are told that certain groups are incapable of learning, as was asserted when low status persons were denied education. At another period we are told that development and achievement are unequal because of factors in the personality of which we are unconscious and that introspective psychotherapeutic preoccupation is the solution. And at still another period we are told that the institutions responsible for schooling can do little, only radical changes in the society itself can make a difference. These assertions have two characteristics in common: 1) No one of them has ever been subjected to a definitive research investigation in which the hypothesis is tested (some of us think they are not researchable questions) and 2) All of them relieve the schools and to some extent the society of responsibility for doing any thing. Clearly if certain people are incapable of learning or too sick to learn or cannot learn until utopia is achieved, why try to improve education or why invest large sums of money in the equalization of educational opportunity or why bother to give all our citizens equal access to these dysfunctional institutions.

I am a professor of education. I have been asked to discuss the meaning of some of the recent attempts to use educational and behavioral science data to support the assertion that schooling can make little difference in the efforts of low status people - Blacks, Chicanos, Native Americans, Puerto Ricans and poverty stricken whites - to

UD019274

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Edmund W. Gordon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

achieve equality or a fair chance at survival. There are primarily two lines of argument which have been advanced.

1. It is asserted that some ethnic groups or races are genetically inferior to others and thus are incapable of benefitting schooling to the same extent as are others. Among the scholars whose work has been used to support this position are Jensen, Herrnstein, Shockley and others.

2. It is asserted that schools make little difference and are not effective forces in changing the life chances of the pupils who pass through them. Among the scholars whose work has been used to support this position are Jencks, Coleman and very recently an international group of scholars including my colleague, Robert Thorndike.

In the debate which has emerged around these two issues, considerable energy has been directed at attacking the individuals whose work has been used and some have even objected to the scientific study of the questions as being immoral or politically dangerous. I want to disassociate myself from any of the arguments directed at limiting free research inquiry and serious discussion of the issues. I believe that the pursuit of knowledge and discussion must be uncensored. I shall not use this platform to join the argument concerning the individuals or their motives, however, there are differences among these scholars and some can be clearly identified as more democratic and humane in their convictions than others. What is more important than how these scholars feel

and what may be their motives is what the media try to tell us about the meaning of this work and what the society decides to do about the problems at which their work is directed.

It should be of particular significance to a group such as we, that those scholarly or not so scholarly pronouncements which support the racist convictions prevalent in the society get a better press than those which do not. Those statements and findings which support our preference not to spend money on the poor or to help low status minorities are given prominance while findings which could lend support to more humanistic development intervention some how seems to be ignored.

For example, when Jensen's work was being published by the Harvard Educational Review and picked up by the press all across this country, there were already major works on the subject which had been ignored. About a year and a half prior to the attention given Jensen's speculations, Margaret Mead and several equally distinguished scholars published through the Columbia University Press, the proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science Symposium on Science and the Concept Race. Neither the black press or the so called liberal white press ran major stories on that contribution to scientific understanding. Could that work have been ignored because it did not come to the popular conclusion that blacks are genetically inferior to whites? And why was that work not highlighted when the press picked up Jensen's work, even if Jensen was not a meticulous enough scholar to have included it and similar works in his own review of existing research on the subject.

Despite the attention that has now been given to the Jensen and Shockley positions,

when Professor Kamin of Princeton University presented and published his masterful analysis of the issues and research related the heritability of intelligence and concluded that there is no evidence to support the assertion, little notice of this development was taken by the media. It appears that when our side scores a point they ignore it, but when the opposition "burps" they give it a headline. There are substantive problems however involved in the questions that Jensen raises and the answers that he offers.

Having concluded that compensatory education and other attempts to improve the intellectual functioning of poor and minority group youngsters have been to no avail, Jensen uses this conclusion to get into a discussion of some issues with which he is preoccupied. These can be summarized in three areas: 1) determination of the relative contributions of genetic and environmental factors to the development of intellectual function, 2) possible inherent differences between racial groups in the quality and character of intellectual capacity, and 3) the possibility that these differences have important implications for the design of learning experiences and may provide a basis for explaining the failure of the schools to educate certain children.

The first of these issues, concerning the relative influences of heredity and environment on the development of intelligence, simply cannot be resolved. This, in part, accounts for the fact that it continues to be debated. The fact is that the technology of human genetic research does not permit definitive study of the genetic constitution of human organisms. We have only in 1969 isolated a single gene - and that in a bacterium. If such technology were available, our attitudes toward research utilizing human subjects would not permit it. The would at least preclude the inclusion of high-status groups in

experimental, comparative studies. In addition, the economic, political, and military commitments of the society obviously do not permit the kinds of experimentation with controlled and improved environmental conditions necessary to the conduct of such studies.

Even if the question could be answered and even if it were definitively determined that a specific portion or aspect of human behavior and potential were fixed by heredity, as a humanist and as an educator, I would still have the commitment to, and the responsibility for, expanding and optimizing the influence of environmental interactions. This is what directed learning or education is all about. Educators cannot manipulate genes; we can control experience and aspects of our environments.

If and when we are able to speak intelligently about the portion of intellectual function attributable to heredity, it will only be under specific interactions or conditions. When we talk about intelligence, we are talking about phenotype, and phenotype by definition is a function of environmental interactions with genotype. It is my judgment that when and if we are able to separate genotype in human behavioral development, its function will only be determinable in relation to, or as it is expressed through, phenotype. And in that relation its function will be determinable only to the extent that the interaction is specified.

The rather pessimistic view of the plasticity of human potential in selected populations which is advanced by some investigators is in part a function of their limited view of the potential significance of interaction variance. As long as they view environmental interactions in "normal" or traditional terms, these investigators severely limit their perspective and hopelessly bias their results. They seem to dismiss the possibility that interaction can be, may be, and in some instances have been made significant in specified

directions. For example, Goldstein has noted that recent advances in medical science have brought under man's control several physical disorders which are clearly genetic in orgin and which might, therefore, according to this limited view of the possibilities of environmental interaction, be regarded as irreversible because genetically "fixed". The discovery of insulin, the isolation of Vitamin D, and the uncovering and control of phenylketonuria, Goldstein (1969) explains:

> ...are all those exceptional environmental changes which will make this interaction term significant. They indicate that environments everywhere are not merely supportive of hereditary potentialities, but can, at times, reverse deleterious effects. The great achievements of mankind lie in making that interaction term significant. Indeed it could almost be a maxim for schools of education, psychology, public health, and medicine: "Make that interaction significant" [p. 20]

The nature-nurture controversy, as Birch (1968) has indicated, is a false issue perpetuated largely through ignorance of advances in scientific research, particularly regarding developmental process. The confusion between the two concepts "genetic" and "determined" underlies much of the problem. That is, while all aspects of an organism may be thought of as 100 percent genetic, they are not 100 percent determined. Rather, phenotype expressions are the result of a continuous biochemical and physiological interaction of the gene complex, cytoplasm, internal milieu, and external environment throughout the life of the organism.

Birch gives us more detailed information about this interaction process. Develop-

mental influence, he notes, begins to complicate research in behavioral genetics even before birth through the influence of the maternal environment. Thus, even at birth phenotypic expressions do not correlate one to one with genotype. Another source of complication arises through differences in rates of maturation and in the patterning of maturation times among separate traits, which may lead to alterations in the patterns of phenotypic expression which do not arise from genetic differences in that trait.

In addition, Birch has noted, studies in behavioral genetics suffer equally from the fact that behavioral analysis is still at a rudimentary stage. What emerges in most research is the end product of learning a maze, the end score differences in discrimination, or mean differences between groups in intelligence test scores, and so on, and there is almost no determination of the specific characteristics of the organism that are involved in the mastery of the presented problem The classic study by Tyron (1940) of the selective breeding of "bright" and "dull" rats illustrates the problem. Analysis of Tyron's study by subsequent investigators suggested that what the rats had been selected for was not "intelligence" but responsiveness to visual or nonvisual cues and aspects of temperament. Searle (1949), for example, showed that when visual cures were used, Tyron's "dull" rats were in some circumstances more effective learners than his "bright" strain.

As Birch pointed out:

> If the data of behavioral genetics permit us to draw any conclusions with respect to learning ability it is that learning ability is by no means a unitary trait, and that in different organisms different patterns of responsiveness, of motivation, of emotionality, and of antecedent history contribute substantially to determining which subgrouping will learn most effectively under conditions of different instruction and task demand. It appears, therefore, that a sober judgment would lead us to conclude that differences in learning achievements, whether measured by intelligence tests or by

> school achievement in human beings, represent the products of different degrees of goodness of fit between the learner, the task, and, in particular, the instructional mode. Such conclusions have positive rather than pejorative implications for a consideration of differences in learning style and achievement in human social groupings [Birch, 1968, p. 561.

Jensen's treatment of the second question that he poses for consideration - the possibility of inherent differences between racial groups in intellectual capacity - is likewise open to criticism on many grounds. According to Fried (1968), the humanistic intentions of most investigators who have studied intelligence, ability, or achievement endowment among different races do not alter the fact that their studies have invariably been based on racial constructs that are destructive and antisocial in addition to being unscientific. In almost all studies the so-called racial background of individual respondents and respondent populations has been derived in ways that show no resemblance to means used by genetic specialists. In those few cases where any information is given about criteria of assortment, one usually finds that skin color has been the sole or dominant criterion, and that as measured by the eye. In other words, the actual genetic background of the subjects is uncontrolled. The classic study by Shuey (1966) on The testing of Negro intelligence illustrates the racist implications of investigations conceived in this mode. In fact, there is as yet no study on a so-called racial sample that adequately links intelligence potential ability, educability, or even achievement to a specifiable set of genetic coordinates associated with an aggregate larger than a family line or perhaps lineage.

The most useful studies linking race and certain specified socially valued traits make no pretense of dealing with biogenetic race: rather, they openly work with categories of "social race". A case in point is the massive survey by Coleman (1966), Equality

of educational opportunity, which focused on psychological reactions of being identified and identifying oneself as a Negro in the United States. If race is to be treated as a sociocultural construct, it is important to get the individual's views on his own identification and the identification he applies to others. However, if race is to be treated as a biological construct, the lay individual's views of his own racial identity or that of anyone else are unqualified and immaterial.

These two concepts of race relate to another flaw in such research to date, most of which has given insufficient attention to the problem of control for economic condition and social-status variance, not to mention physical conditions and surroundings. Investigators conducting these studies seem to feel that they have controlled for socioeconomic variance when the two comparison groups are selected from comparable income or occupational levels. However, most students of economic and ethnic status concede that equal income for whites and blacks in the United States, or comparable occupational level, greatly camouflages differential patterns of cultural experience and social interaction. Unless one is also arguing that conditions of life have no impact on affective and cognitive development, these sources of variance cannot be ignored in equating groups.

Even when comparison groups are established on the basis of comparability of income and of life conditions within the generation being studied, the problems of intergenerational variance and its contribution to physical and behavioral development are ignored. If, for instance, one selects fifty middle-class white children in New York City and compares them with fifty middle-class black children, the likelihood is that the families of the white children will have been at the middle-class status level for a longer time. Then,

when one considers the relationship between socioeconomic status and health and nutritional status, and the derivative relationship between health and nutritional status and the quality of fetal life and development, the ludicrous character of failure to control for such variation becomes obvious.

We have, then, in these efforts at studying behavioral differences in racial groups, problems that relate to the identification and specification of pure race as well as problems in control for variations in life conditions. These variations so greatly confound racial effects as to make their separation impossible of solution by those who have sought to investigate the problem thus far. We might conclude that to create the social conditions necessary to make such investigation scientifically accurate and possible would be very likely to actually eliminate the problem before it could be examined!

If these questions regarding intellingence, race, and genetics are so difficult, even impossible, of solution given present scientific skill, what is the relevance of the controversy? Of course, we cannot fail to see the possible racist implications of this kind of superficially supported assertion regarding ethnic inferiority. Broader social consequences threaten if we give prevalence to those theories that posit only a limited effectiveness for environmental interaction. My argument with those who hold this more narrow view is that, despite their claim to interest in the advancement of science, few of them support the kinds and magnitude of changes in social, economic, and political conditions which could make the interaction component more significant and their own research more possible. I cannot accept this stance since it is supportive of the status quo: it means business as usual· it means limited opportunity for black and poor people. It means that we invest too

little effort in trying to make the interaction significant, while the majority tries to fix the blame on the victims or on nature for differences, underdevelopment, or school failures, all of which are largely imposed on lower-status persons by man's indifference to, or abuse of, his fellow man.

It is this problem that relates to the purposes and intent of the society or its principal spokesmen that I call to your attention. In a sense it is this issue that Jencks is concerned with but it tends to get lost in his effort to justify his conclusion on the basis of the reanalysis of sundry, secondary data. Jencks uses his analysis of the relationship between schooling and the achievement of economic equality to make the point that the two have little or no direct relationship in the agregate, that is to say, for the totality of our population what happens in school does not significantly influence the way in which income is distributed in the society. It is this part of his statement which has received considerable attention and is used to support the position of those who would reduce expenditures on schooling or make reduced demands of education. But his basic message is different and more important. Jencks claims that public policy decisions have never been seriously focused on equalization of income or economic status, and concludes that "as long as egalitarians assume that public policy cannot contribute to economic equality directly, but must proceed by ingenious manipulations of marginal institutions like the schools, progress will remain glacial. If we want to move beyond this tradition," he argues, "we will have to establish political control over the economic institutions that shape our society." Now I cannot take issue with this conclusion. I do object to the fact that the portion of Jenck's pronouncement that serves the status quo has been publici-

zied and the part that threatens this has been ignored. Also I have problems with the questions he has posed and the way he has arrived at his conclusions.

As an educator I am not as much concerned with the contribution that education makes to income distribution as I am to its contribution to development of competent, happy and socially useful individuals. When I wear my hat as political economist and political being I am very much concerned with equality of economic status or at least with the abolition of economic disadvantaged status. For a long time now I have known that the problem of economic inequality would not be solved through education at other than some individual cases. I argued that point in my paper "Some Theoretical and Practical Problems in Compensatory Education as an Antidote to Poverty" which is published in Allen's Psychological Factors in Poverty. But let us return to the problems of education and the value of schooling. The data of the several studies which Jencks and his associates have reanalyzed use intelligence and achievement kit scores as their primary indicators of competence. None of these studies are concerned with happiness and social usefulness as outcome dimensions. Jencks acknowledges some of the limitations of intelligence and achievement testing and dismisses the affective domain with a four page chapter in which he concedes that he knows little about this area and has not given attention to it in his reanalysis. Now there are several problems here.

1. There is no question but that if we look at intelligence and achievement test scores for large numbers of pupils and try to relate them to the characteristics of schools as we usually measure them, we find little variation that can be attributed to the impact of school. This was one of the major findings from the Coleman study, Equality

of Educational Opportunity. However, even Jencks concedes that Coleman's findings and the other available data did not include assessments of teacher-pupil and pupil-pupil interaction. These and other interactions I call process variables which probably make for differences when status variables like number of books, age of building and expenditure per pupil do not. Additionally, since Jencks was looking for gross effects one of Coleman's findings probably seems less important to him. Coleman reported that for the most disadvantaged children and black children quality of school does make a difference in terms of achievement. In other words, differences in the quality and quantity of schooling in the U.S.A. seem to make little difference in your achievement scores unless you are poor or black, If you are both, it seems to me schooling might make a powerful difference in your scores and your life chances.

2. Many educators believe that teaching and learning transactions deeply involve the affective (emotional) domain - one's feelings, sense of happiness, satisfaction, purpose, belonging, etc. It is these variables which are hardest to measure and are usually omitted from these studies either as inputs or outcomes. In fact from the Coleman data we see that a little measure, crudely conducted, of sense of power or environmental control, was more powerfully associated with achievement than any other variable studied save family background. Jencks did not study the affective and process variables, as input or output of the schools.

3. There appears to be considerable confounding or contaminating of data in the kind of analyses Jencks has used to arrive at the conclusion that schooling makes little difference. He concludes for instance that if "all elementary schools were equally

effective, cognitive inequality among sixth graders would decline less than 3 percent." Now the data upon which this estimate is arrived at are the same data that reflect the problems referred to in my previous two points. In addition, Jencks uses the term "equally effective". It would be interesting to know what direction his argument would take if we used my term maximally effective. Schooling as a part of the process by which we facilitate development in our children must - though it never has - define its goals in terms of maximal effectiveness. This involves us in the process of predicting not what will happen if the child and the school continue to function at their present levels, but what happens if we put the two in orbit and free them from the restraints which probably are limiting both.

We must remember that Jencks was not concerned with what schooling can do to develop people, he was particularly concerned with what schooling can do to increase and equalize economic status. These are related but quite different processes. It is to the process of human development and learning that I have devoted my professional career. An examination of some of the factors which may complicate those processes may help us to put into proper perspective the conflicting opinion we hear concerning the influence of schooling.

For almost twenty-five years, hanging near my desk has been a print of the beautiful Thomas Hart Benton drawing which he aptly titled "Instruction." This sensitive drawing of an old black man with his tattered books, papers, clothing and surroundings is shown working at the task of helping a young black child to learn. It symbolizes an endeavor to which a host of persons, before and after this simple soul, have devoted their efforts --

some enthusiastically and with skill, others reluctantly and with incompetence. Would that the problems of teaching and learning were as simple as the spirit Benton captures in this drawing. Too many black children fail to master the traditional learning tasks of schooling. Too many Puerto Rican, Chicano and Native American (American Indian) chiidren are failed in our schools. Children from minority groups and low income families are over represented among our schools' failures. Why?

The problems involved in the equalization of educational achievement patterns across economic and ethnic groups continue to defy solution. The attempts at describing, evaluating and interpreting these problems and the efforts directed at their solution are frequently confusing. Over the past several years a variety of special programs have been developed to improve the educational achievement of disadvantaged children. These programs have spanned a range from preschool through college; their special emphases have included special guidance services to experimental curriculums: they have grown from a few special efforts in the great cities to nation-wide, federally sponsored programs supported by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Office of Education under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Thousands of special programs have been spawned. Ten billion and more dollars have been spent over the past several years. Yet despite all of this activity, there is little evidence to suggest that we have come close to solving the problems of educating large numbers of ethnic minority group and poor white children.

The relative lack of success of these efforts at upgrading academic achievement in the target populations has resulted in some criticizing of the educational services provided, but has also resulted in a renewal of old arguments in support of the explanation

of differences in the level of intellectual function across ethnic groups based on alledged inferior genetic traits in lower status groups. Neither of the simplistic approaches to understanding the problems or fixing the blame for our failure to make school achievement independent of ethnic or social class is adequate.

The problems of educating black and other disadvantaged populations who have been accidentally or deliberately, but always, systematically deprived of the opportunity for optimal development is far more complex. The problem of equalizing educational achievement across groups with differential economic, political and social status may confront us with contradictions which defy resolution. Adequate understanding and appropriate planning for an attack upon these problems will require that attention be directed to several issues. Among these are: (1) the problems related to differential patterns of intellectual and social function as well as varying degrees of readiness in multivariant populations served by schools whose programs are too narrowly conceived and too inflexible to provide the variety of conditions for learning dictated by the characteristics of the children served. (2) the problems related to the conditions of children's bodies and the conditions of their lives which may render them incapable of optimal development and which may seriously interfer with adequate function: (3) the problems related to ethnic, cultural and political incongruencies between the schools and their staffs on the one hand, and the children and communities served on the other: and (4) the problems related to the public schools as social institutions which have never been required to assume responsibility for their failures and thus become accountable to the society and its specific members whom they serve.

Differential Characteristics and Differential Treatments

Despite the long history in education of concern with meeting the special needs of individual children and the highly respected status of differential psychology as a field of study, schools have made little progress in achieving a match between the developmental patterns, learning styles and tempermental traits of learners and the educational experiences to which they are exposed. A great deal of attention has been given to differences in level of intellectual function. This is reflected in the heavy emphasis on intelligence testing and the placement, ever "tracking" of pupils based on these tests. This tradition has emphasized quantitative measurement, classification and prediction to the neglect of qualitative measurement, description and prescription. These latter processes are clearly essential to the effective teaching of children who come to the schools with characteristics different from their teachers and the children with whom most teachers are accustomed. Our research data indicate wide variations in patterns of intellectual and social function across and within subpopulations. These variations in function within privileged populations may be less important becuase of a variety of environmental factors which support adequate development and learning. Among disadvantaged populations where traditional forms of environmental support may be absent, attention to differential learning patterns may be crucial to adequate development.

Some workers in the field have given considerable attention to differential patterns of language structure and usage. For example, importance has been attached to "black English" or the dialects of black peoples as possible contributing to low academic achievement. These indigenous language forms are viewed by some as obstacles to be overcome. Others view them as behavioral phenemonena to be utilized in learning. Workers holding

the former position stress the teaching of "standard English" or English as a second language. Those holding the latter view emphasize the adaptation of learning experiences and materials to the indigenous language of the child. The debate is probably not important except as it may reflect respect or lack of respect for the language behavior of the learner. What may be more important than the fact of language difference is the role that language behavior plays in the learning behavior of the specific child. To understand and utilize that relationship in the education of the child requires more than teaching him how to translate "black English" into standard English and requires more than making him a more proficient utilizer of the indigenous language. Understanding the role of one set of behaviors as facilitators of more comprehensive behaviors is at the heart of differential analysis of learner characteristics and differential design of learning experiences. Schooling for black children, indeed for all children in our schools, comes nowhere near to meeting these implied criteria. Assessment technology has not seriously engaged the problem. Curriculum specialists are just beginning to, in some of the work in individually prescribed learning.

Life Conditions: Health, Nutrition and Learning

Contemporary research provides evidence of a variety of behaviors and conditions which are encountered in children from economically disadvantaged backgrounds with sufficient frequency to justify the conclusion that they are either induced by, or nurtured by conditions of poverty. The excellent studies by Knobloch and Pasamanick of the relationships between health status and school adjustment in low-income Negro children in

Baltimore, by Lashof of health status and services in Chicago's South Side, and by Birch of health status and related learning patterns in an entire age group of school children in Aberdeen, Scotland, also of the health status of children from indigent families in the Caribbean area, provide mounting evidence in support of the hypothesis that there exists a continuum of reproductive errors and developmental defects significantly influenced by level of income. According to this hypothesis the incidence of reproductive error or developmental defect occurs along a continuum in which the incidence of error or defect is greatest in the population for which medical, nutritional and child care are poorest and the incidence least where such care is best.

These studies point clearly to the facts that:

(1) nutritional resources for the mother-to-be, the pregnant mother and fetus, and the child she bears are inadequate;

(2) except for the Aberdeen population studied by Birch, representing a society in which health care is considered a right, not a privilege, and is available to all, medical care -- prenatal, obstetrical and postnatal --is generally poor;

(3) the incidence of subtle to more severe neurologic defects is relatively high in low-income children;

(4) case finding, lacking systematic procedures, is hit or miss, leaving the child not only handicapped by the disorder but frequently with no official awareness that the condition exists;

(5) family resources and sophistication are insufficient to provide the remedial and/or compensatory supports which can spell the difference

between handicap and competent function.

These health-related conditions are thought to have important implications for school and general social adjustment. We know that impaired health or organic dysfunction influences school attendance, learning efficiency, developmental rate, personality development, etc. Pasamanick attributes a substantial portion of the behavior disorders noted in this population to the high incidence of subtle neurologic disorders. Silver relates a variety of specific learning disabilities to mild to severe neurologic abnormalities in children. Lustman and Greenburg have noted the relationship between frequent or chronic illnesses and poor school achievement. Clearly, adequacy of health status and adequacy of health care in our society are influenced by adequacy of income, leading to the obvious conclusion that poverty results in a number of conditions directly referrable to health and indirectly to development in general, including educational development.

Cultural, Ethnic and Political Incongruencies

Ethnic and economic integration in education for a brief while appeared to be a possible solution to underachievement in lower status children. The data seem to indicate that academic achievement for black children improves when they are educated in middle-class and predominantly white schools. It is not at all clear that ethnic mix makes the difference. However, the evidence overwhelmingly supports an association between separation by economic group and school achievement with low economic status being associated with low school achievement. Consistently, poor children attending school in poor neighborhoods tend to show low level school achievement.

Before-and-after studies of desegregated schools have also tended to show that achievement levels rise with desegregation, although the exact interplay of reactions leading to this result has not yet been conclusively defined. For example, the process of desegregation may, by improving teacher morale or bringing about other changed conditions, result in an over-all increase in the quality of education throughout the system. There have been a number of studies examining the possible relationship of integration (along racial or status group lines) and achievement, and the over-all results of these efforts appear to demonstrate that children from lower status groups attending schools where pupils from higher status families are in the majority attain improved achievement levels, with no significant lowering of achievement for the higher status group. However when children from higher status groups are in the minority in the school, there tends not to be an improvement in the achievement of the lower status group.

Although these findings are generally supported in mass data compiled from large-scale populations, studies of minority group performance under experimental conditions of ethnic mix suggest a need for caution in making similar observations for smaller populations and individual cases. From these findings it becomes clear that the impact of assigned status and perceived conditions of comparison (that is, the subjects' awareness of the norms against which their data will be evaluated) results in a quite varied pattern of performance on the part of the lower status group subjects. Thus, it may be dangerous to generalize that across-the-board economic ethnic and social class integration will automatically result in positive improvement for the lower status group.

To further complicate the picture a new renaissance in cultural nationalism among all disadvantaged ethnic minorities has brought into question our assumptions concerning

ethnic integration and education. In a society which has alternately pushed ethnic separation or ethnic amalgamation and which has never truly accepted cultural and ethnic pluralism as its model, blacks, chicanos, Puerto Ricans and native Americans are insisting that the traditional public school is not only guilty of intellectual and social but cultural genocide for their children. For many members of these groups the problem in education for blacks is that they have been subjected to white education which they see as destrictive to black people. When one views this argument in the context of the current stage in the development of craft unionism in education, the position cannot be ignored. The conditions and status of professional workers in education are justly the concern of their unions but blacks increasingly view the union concern as being in conflict with their concern for their children's development. That in New York City the workers are predominantly white makes it easy for the conflict to be viewed as ethnic in origin unless one looks at the situation in Washington, D.C., where Negroes are heavily represented in the educational staff, but some of the problems between professionals and clients are no less present.

There are class and caste conflicts to which insufficient attention has been given in the organization and delivery of educational services. If cultural and ethnic identification are important components of the learning experience, to ignore or demean them is poor education. If curriculum and delivery systems do not take these factors into account, inefficient learning may be the result. One would hope that black education by black educators is not the only solution, yet we are being pressed to no longer ignore it as a possible solution.

Would that the problems ended even there. It may well be that what has surfaced as cultural nationalism may be only the wave crest of a more important issue. Public schools as social institutions have never been required to assume responsibility for their failures. They, nonetheless, eagerly accept credit for the successes of their students. This may be related in part to the functions that schools serve in modern societies. The noted anthropologist, Anthony Wallace, has discussed the differential attention given to training in technique or skills education for morality, and the development of intellect in societies which are revolutionary, conservative or reactionary. For more than one hundred years the United States has been a conservative society -- liberal in its traditions but essentially conservative in its functions. Some of us fear that that conservatism has given way to a reactionary stance. According to Wallace, the conservative society places highest emphasis on training in techniques and skills, with secondary attention to morality (correct behavior) and the least attention to the development of the intellect. Societies in the reactionary phase place greatest emphasis on morality (now defined as law and order) second emphasis on techniques and skills and only slight or no attention to the development of intellect. He sees society in its revolutionary phase as placing greatest emphasis on morality (humanistic concerns), with second-level interest on the development of intellect, and the least attention given to training in technique. Schools may not have developed a tradition of accountability because techniques and skills may be the least difficult of the learning task to master, if the conditions for learning are right. For large numbers of children who have progressed in the mastery of technique, their status in the society has facilitated technique mastery. For those who have

not mastered the skills our society has been able to abosrb them into low skill work and non-demanding life situations. But by the mid 20th century, entry into the labor force and participation in the affairs of the society increasingly requires skills and techniques mastery. Those who would move toward meaningful participation and the assertion of power are increasingly demanding that the schools be accountable not only for pupils' mastery of skills, but also for the nurturance of morality and the development of intellectuality. In fact with the rapidly increasing demand for adaptability and trainability in those who are to advance in the labor force, DuBois' concern with the liberating arts and sciences (the development of intellect)moves to the fore. Yet we must remember that the schools are at present instruments of a conservative (possibly reactionary) society, but blacks, other minority groups and poor people increasingly see revolution (radical change) as the only ultimate solution to the problems and conditions in which their lives are maintained. As such, their concern with schooling may more sharply focus on issues related to morality and intellectual development, broadly defined-- concerns which the schools have never been competent to meet. If circumstance has converted these concerns to educational needs, the schools then, in their present form, are ill prepared to educate these young people whose ideals and goals should be revolutionary, not conservative, and certainly not reactionary. But this does not mean that schooling cannot be effective in the development of young people. To insure that our schools effectively educate is one of our tasks. To reduce or eliminate economic inequality is a related but separate task.